MB DOCKET No. 04-233

RESIDENCE TO LOCALISM NOTICE OFFICE OFFICE

DEAR CHIEF,

PLEASE KEEP FREE SPEECH FREE AND DO NOT TAMPER WITH CHRISTIAN AND RELIGIOUS PROGRAMMING!

- 1. DON'T FORCE EVERY CHRISTIAN RADIO STATION TO TAKE PROGRAMMING ADVICE FROM COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARDS.
- 2. DON'T REQUIRE HOW MUCH PROGRAMMING OF VARIOUS TYPES HAS BEEN BROASCAST, WHO PRODUCES ECT. TO BE REPORTED EVERY THREE MONTHS.
- 3. DO NOT REQUIRE STATIONS TO DELIVER
  THE MESSAGES PROMULGATED BY SECULAR
  HUMANISTS, ABORTIONISTS OR ATHEISTS.
  - Y. DON'T MAKE LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS

    ANYMONE TIME CONSUMING THAN IT ALREADY

    IS NOW, OR ANYMONE EXPENSIVE.

- 5. SINCE PROGRAMMING IS DELIVERED

  BY SATELLITE, DON'T REQUIRE STAFFING

  AT ALL RADIO STATIONS. EMPLOYEE

  LABOR COST ANE HIGH.
- 6. DON'T REPUIRE RELOCATION OF MAIN STUDIO FACILITIES,

THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION, THE GOVERNMENT MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO IMPOSE RULES THAT VIOLATE IT.

SINCERELY
Robert J. Hammond
107 STRATFORD Dr.
FAIRFIELD GLASE TN 38558
931-707-1212

Received on 17 17 mg I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Netice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3)The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular (5) stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

ū	•	•		
Beulop	M. Ma	rten	2-29-08	···
Signature			APT. # 246	
m			500 W. POLK A	VE, CHARLESTON, 12
BEULAH		77 <b>M</b>		
Name		•	217-345-28	
			Phone	
Title (if any)	·			at taken basa a seria di
Omanization (if	any)			

MAR 1 / 2008

## Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Many of the proposals in NPRM, contrary to the FCC's stated objectives, would harm both localism and diversity of viewpoints.

The true wellsprings of localism and diversity are smaller market radio stations and stations offering specialized programming (including religion, foreign language, ethnic and alternative programming). These types of stations also serve as important gateways for new entrants seeking business opportunities in broadcasting – increasing ownership among those traditionally underrepresented.

But just as major operating costs are quickly rising, and more Americans are turning to new media, the NPRM proposes measures that would substantially raise costs – something that will be keenly felt among small market and specialized programming broadcasters. The rational economic response will be service cutbacks or outright shutdowns. Neither outcome is in the public interest.

One of these ill-advised proposals would force radio stations to curtail reliance on labor-saving technology. An end to unstaffed operations will not improve responsiveness to a local community. To the contrary, it will likely lead stations to broadcast fewer hours or shut down altogether. Unattended operation with proper safeguards has helped small stations provide more service through efficiency. Take that away, and the Commission will create strong disincentive for stations to stay on during the late evening or early morning hours, hours during which very little revenue is generated. The increased operational costs will lead new entrepreneurs, including women and minorities, to look elsewhere to invest their savings and sweat equity.

The Commission must also reject proposal that would further limit where broadcasters can locate their main studios. The Commission acted in the public interest when it adopted rules many years ago to permit stations greater flexibility in selecting the location of their main studios, particularly in situations in which a broadcaster operates stations licensed to several nearby communities. If the Commission were to force each station to establish its main studio only in that station's community of license, the result would be that broadcasters — particularly small market and speciality programming broadcasters — would have to divert their limited financial resources from supporting and enhancing quality programming to covering additional and unnecessary real estate costs.

The FCC should also jettison proposals forcing stations to give away airtime to community groups. One proposal would even enforce public access requirements, similar to cable PEG channels. Cable has dozens, even hundreds of channels from which it can profit, but smaller market radio and stations serving small specialized audiences do not. Free is not really free to those who struggle every day just to keep the electricity flowing, the programming going, and the local news covered.

Smaller stations are keenly attuned to the communities they serve – it is how they remain in business. But the balance is delicate, and the Commission must not take action that will tip the balance so stations cut back on service or drop out. There is no 'public interest' in service that is both diminished and less diverse.

Respectfully submitted,	2-9-08
Signature	3-4-08 Date
	200/ S Han and and
Name	Address 200 AO 62704
	217-5011-5354
Title (if any)	Phone
Organization (if any)	

### Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Organization (if any)

Received	&	Inspected
MCOA.		

MB Docket No. 04-233	<b>7</b>	lecelved & Inspector
I submit the following comments in response "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No.	to the Localism Notice of Proposed	Rulemakina the na
Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures n proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would	nust not violate First Amendment rig do so – and must not be adopted.	ht FGG Mail Room
(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, e people who do not share their values. The NPRM's punconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters values could face increased harassment, complaints consciences, rather than allowing incompatible views Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.	roposed advisory board proposals v who resist advice from those who do and even loss of license for choosin points to shape their programming.	would impose such on't share their ig to follow their own The First
(2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio static rights to air time. Proposed public access requireme conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amandates on any religion.	nts would do so – even if a religious	broadcaster
(3) The FCC must not force revelation of sp of programming, especially religious programming, is proposals to force reporting on such things as who p constitutionally-protected editorial choices.	not properly dictated by any govern	nment agency = and
(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered automatically barred from routine renewal application review of certain classes of applicants by the Commirce religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive	n processing. The proposed manda issioners themselves would amount consciences and present only the m	tory special renewal to coercion of essages they
(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a ch squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (Raising costs with these proposals would force servipublic interest.	allenge. Yet, the Commission prop substantially raising costs in two wa (b) by further restricting main studio	oses to further ys: (a) by requiring location choices.
We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or p	policies discussed above.	
Herry a Willman Signature	March 11, 2008  Date	
	475 Paris Pike, Mt.	<u> </u>
Henry A. Hillman	Address	40353
Name	859/497-2166	
	Phone	
Title (if any)		

Organization (if any)

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaki Maine Room, neleased Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must antibolishe Final discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would define the FCC. "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must Any Docket First Amendment rights. A number of

proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice (3)of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular (5)stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest/

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature TICA CORNELIUS Address Name 770-335 -6453 Fresislent
Title (if any) Phone

## I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the"NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amediment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

1716 5 Plum Ridge Rd., Ronda, NC

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature and Date

Signature and Date

Name and Address

Mail By April 14, 2008 to:

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
Attn: Chief, Media Bureau

# I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the"NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment Aghts. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature and Date

Burlie Speaks 4820 Old Salis Dury Rd. Union Grove NC 28689

Name and Address

Mail By April 14, 2008 to:

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
Attn: Chief, Media Bureau

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rule Heaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A pumper of the proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Angel Coldwell 4818 Old Splisbury PolyUNION GROVE NC 28689

### Mail By April 14, 2008 to:

The Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554 Attn: Chief, Media Bureau

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

" France State Realities

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Melissa A. Southerland
Name

Date

03/10/2008
Date

2204 Bishops Bridge Rd.
Knoxville, Tn 37922
Address

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the

A Real of the Control of the Control

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from (1) people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature

2204 Bishops Bridge Rd.

Knoxville, Tn 37922

Address

03/10/2008 Date

Derek W. Southerland

Name

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Pyterhaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

March 10, 2008

Date

Date

ARON WILLOUGHBY

Address

47 533 8976

Phone

Peceived & Inspector
MAR 17 22000

Prosed Rulenekharthe

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemek Market (\*NPRM\*), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{U}}$ 

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

| March 10 2008 |
| Date | Date |
| Signature | 2|01 | Timborucood ct |
| Address holoanon mo 65536 |
| Name | 4/17-7/8-6985 |
| Phone | Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

## Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: UPAGAGA

MAR 1 7 9003

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rule fight Room "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233 MAR 17

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Angergment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

	·
Signature LINDA SIMONE	3/7/08  Date  2180 E. WARM SPRINGS RD #1146  Address LAS VEGAS, NV 89119  Bhone  361) 549-6938 CELL
Name	361) 549- 6938 CELL
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Relemaking (the U08 Mail Room "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must hot Diolate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice (3) of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above. Name

Organization (if any)

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking "), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment Is discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, world, do so – and must not for the doc." "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, world do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious finances, to take advice from

- people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5)Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or po	licies discussed above.
Signature	3-9-08 Date
Lowis E. PRINC	BOX358 BITT-FAMY ON 4372
Name	740-680.1482 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

# Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Received & Inspected MB Docket No. 04-233

MIS DOCKET NO. U4-233		H. m	- ~ moperti
I submit the following comments in response t "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 0	o the Localism Notice of Pro		
Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures me proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would describe the second secon	ust not violate First Amenda	ient rights. A	C Mail Room number of
(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, espeople who do not share their values. The NPRM's prunconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters walues could face increased harassment, complaints a consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpo Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.	oposed advisory board prop the resist advice from those and even loss of license for c pints to shape their programi	osals would in who don't sha choosing to fo ming. The Fin	mpose such are their Illow their own rst
(2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station rights to air time. Proposed public access requirement conscientiously objects to the message. The First Ammandates on any religion.	ts would do so - even if a re	ligious broad	caster
(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific programming, especially religious programming, is proposals to force reporting on such things as who proconstitutionally-protected editorial choices.	not properly dictated by any	government a	
(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered automatically barred from routine renewal application review of certain classes of applicants by the Commis religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive	processing. The proposed r sioners themselves would a onsciences and present only	mandatory spo mount to coes the message	ecial renewal rcion of es they
(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on t stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a char squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by s staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b Raising costs with these proposals would force service public interest.	llenge. Yet, the Commissio ubstantially raising costs in t ) by further restricting main t	n proposes to wo ways: (a) studio location	further by requiring n choices.
We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or po	licies discussed above.		
Barbara Royer	2/26/08 Date	<del></del>	
Barbara Royer	1994 W. Co. Rd. 9 Address Clay Cit	y In	44841
Name	812 939 76 Phone	•	
Title (if any)			
Organization (if any)			

For the clock may soon be still.

### STORY NUMBER TWO

3 o: ld d War II produced many heroes. One such man was Lieutenant Commander Butch O'Hare. He +

Received & Inspected

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rule (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB/Dacket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Monica Stanomo Signature	March 5, 2008
Monica Stevens	12791 S. St. Rd. 159 Address [aSonville, In. 47438
Name	(815)612-9331
Mrs. Title (if any)	Phone
Organization (if any)	(2) MAC - 4
OTRACIFICATION (II ALLA)	

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Relemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not vibilitie First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Signature  Shrana Drau	Date POBOXZZ  423 N Linden None Prairie KS 67013  Address
Name	620-488-2764 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

MAR 1 7 2009

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemakouthail Room "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not applicate. First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

VICTORY BAPTIST CHURCH Organization (if any)

MAR 1 7 2009

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233. FCC Mail Room

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so and bust not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutoacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature

Signature

Date

Da

This LOC cause not establish a two-dutad renowal aye and lossened an inconsequence in our establishment from it in the stability forms the renewal application processing. The proposition and device in the relations of constructions of sonotionals by the stable selection shows the resolver the relations broadcasters. These interests the content of a content of the reservers the content of a content only the message of the Quantization (traff) eliefs could have true, sepondent and potentially minous returned properties.

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Received (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment fights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Organization (if any)

Januar Signature	3-10-08 Date
Oignature	// S n/ !
Vernon A Reimer	4512 San Miquel Address Kers Field CD 93300
Name	
Dayl	661-872-6831 Phone
Title (if any)	
Title (if any)	

See Alberta Dailson

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Reposet "NPRM"), released an A24, 2008 in MB Dipoket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies are proposale discontinuous propos

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster. particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3)The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways; (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Name

3-08-08

5486 US 70 E Address Goldshovo, NC 27534

-778-1818

MAR 1 7 2009

### Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

**FCC Mail Room** 

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must rect vi@laterFirst Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who regist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Signature  RICHARD B HEFTY SR	3-11-2008  Date  533 BLANCHARW ST  BELLE FONTE, PA 16823  Address
Name	
	Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Lillie M. Jely	3-10-08 Date
Signature  Lillie M. Feltz	13918 Maple Un. Alato Mo Address 65552
Name	417 - 458 - 4955 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

FCC=

### Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

ents in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking cket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-238/08 MAR / 7

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Americane rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

vve urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.	
Don D Orice	3/8/2008
Signature Signature	26.56 Melbourne Drip
Don G Price	Date 2656 Melbourne Drive Richmond, VA 2325 Address
Name	(804) 330-7317 Phone
itle (if any)	
Organization (if any)	